

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 3, 2005. Claims 1-19 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-19 were rejected. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,445 issued to Davis et al. (hereinafter "*Davis*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,746,254 issued to Hooper et al. (hereinafter "*Hooper*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Davis* nor *Hooper*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the limitations of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that *Davis* purportedly discloses the limitations of independent Claim 1 except for a guide ("*Davis* does not disclose expressly wherein the chassis support further having at least one guide adapted to align the mounting post with the keyhole" (Office Action, page 2)). The Examiner further indicates that *Hooper* purportedly teaches such limitation and that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a guide to the circuit board system of *Davis* (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to rely on a retainer 32 of *Hooper* as corresponding to the "guide adapted to align the mounting post with the keyhole" as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added) (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree. *Hooper* appears to disclose a retainer 32 that is secured to predetermined locations on a chassis 50 of the *Hooper* system (*Hooper*, column 3, lines 32-43, column 4, lines 45-48, figures 2 and 7). *Hooper* also appears to disclose that the retainer 32 includes a board retainer 40 constructed of a resilient

material that is depressable relative to a remaining retainer body 34 of the retainer 32 (*Hooper*, column 3, lines 32-43, column 4, lines 45-48, figures 2 and 7). *Hooper* also recites:

During installation of the circuit board 60 onto the chassis 50, the board retainer 40 may be slightly depressed. Holes 62 in the circuit board 60 are located over the heads 22 of the fasteners 10. The circuit board 60 may then be moved toward the rear panel 52. When the circuit board 60 is properly located, the board retainer 40 may return to its original position and contact the circuit board 60. As a result, the board retainer 40 may restrict movement of the circuit board 60 caused by spring tension of the fasteners 10.

(*Hooper*, column 4, lines 53-59, figures 2 and 7) (emphasis added). Thus, *Hooper* appears to disclose that the retainer 32 of *Hooper* is used to restrict movement of the circuit board 60 of *Hooper* and not to align the circuit board 60 of *Hooper* with the fasteners 10 of *Hooper*. To the contrary, *Hooper* appears to clearly disclose that during alignment of the circuit board 60 with the fasteners 10 of *Hooper*, the board retainer 40 of the retainer 32 is depressed so that it is not in contact with the circuit board 60. Further, the remaining portions of the retainer 32 of *Hooper* appear to have no function related to aligning the circuit board 60 with the fasteners 10 of *Hooper*. For example, *Hooper* recites: “The retainer body 34 [of the retainer 32] may support a portion of the circuit board 60. The retaining body 34 may impart additional structural stability to the circuit board 60.” (*Hooper*, column 4, lines 47-50). Thus, the retaining body 34 of the retainer 32 of *Hooper* appears to provide nothing more than a support surface onto which the circuit board 60 rests. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the retainer 32 of *Hooper* does not “align the mounting post with the keyhole” as recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least this reason, neither *Davis* nor *Hooper*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the limitations of independent Claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine reference teachings as proposed by the Examiner. For example, the Examiner appears to indicate that the motivation for combining reference teachings is that “by adding the guide to the circuit board system it [sic] may support a portion of the circuit board and may impart

additional structural stability to the circuit board” (Office Action, page 3) (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed basis indicated by the Examiner for combining reference teachings because of the deficiency of *Davis* appears to have no relation to the deficiency of *Davis* identified by the Examiner, namely, a guide for “align[ing] the mounting post with the keyhole” as recited by Claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason also, Applicants respectfully submit the proposed combination of references is improper.

In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that at least *Hooper* appears to teach away from the proposed combination. For example, as discussed above, during installation of the circuit board 60 of *Hooper*, the retainer 32 of *Hooper* is depressed such that it is not in contact with the circuit board 60 (*Hooper*, column 4, lines 53-59, figures 2 and 7). Thus, *Hooper* appears to disclose that the retainer 32 of *Hooper* is not in contact with the circuit board 60 of *Hooper* and performs no function relative to the circuit board 60 of *Hooper* until after the circuit board 60 of *Hooper* has been properly located (*Hooper*, column 4, lines 53-59, figures 2 and 7). Therefore, for at least this reason also, Applicants respectfully submit the proposed combination of references is improper.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, and Claims 2-7 that depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references.

Independent Claim 8 recites “a mounting post coupled to a printed circuit board assembly” and “a computer chassis having at least one support member, the support member having a keyhole adapted to receive the mounting post, the support member further having at least one guide adapted to align the mounting post with the keyhole” (emphasis added), and independent Claim 15 recites “means formed in the chassis support member for enabling slidable engagement of the coupling means with the chassis support member” and “means for aligning the coupling means with the means for enabling slidable engagement (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully

submit also that neither *Davis* nor *Hooper*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the limitations of independent Claims 8 and 15. Further, as discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine references teachings and, moreover, at least *Hooper* teaches away from the proposed combination of *Davis* and *Hooper*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 8 and 15, and Claims 9-14 and 16-19 that depend respectively therefrom, are also patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *James L. Baudino*
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: December 16, 2005

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884